

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 163-198 are pending. Claims 1-162 have been canceled without prejudice. Claims 163-198 have been added. No new matter has been added. In view of advancing the prosecution of the pending claims, Applicants will address the Pryor reference in view of the claims 163-198.

In response to the Office Action mailed September 7, 2005, the Examiner's claim rejections have been considered. Applicants respectfully traverse all rejections regarding all pending claims and earnestly solicit allowance of these claims.

1. Claim Objections due to informality

Claim 75 is objected to due to various claim informalities. Applicants have canceled claim 75 thereby rendering the rejection moot. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the claim objection.

2. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph

Claims 18, 19, 43, 44, 64, 65, and 104-107 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Claims 18, 19, 43, 44, 64, 65, and 104-107 have been canceled thereby rendering the rejection moot. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

Claims 111 and 121-126 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Claims 111 and 121-126 have been canceled thereby rendering the rejection moot. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

Claims 112 and 127-133 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Claims 112 and 127-133 have been canceled thereby rendering the rejection moot. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

Claims 113 and 134-140 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Claims 113 and 134-140 have been canceled thereby rendering the rejection moot. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

Claims 114 and 141-147 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Claims 114 and 141-147 have been canceled thereby rendering the rejection moot. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

Claim 162 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Claims 162 have been canceled thereby rendering the rejection moot. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

### 3. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 4 has been canceled thereby rendering the rejection moot. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

Claims 16, 41, 62 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 16, 41, 62 have been canceled thereby rendering the rejection moot. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

Claims 19, 19, 43, 44, 64 and 65 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 19, 19, 43, 44, 64 and 65 have been canceled thereby rendering the rejection moot. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

Claims 23, 48 and 69 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 23, 48 and 69 have been canceled thereby rendering the rejection moot. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

Claims 74-78 and 81-97 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 74-78 and 81-97 have been canceled thereby rendering the rejection moot. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

Claims 79 and 80 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 79 and 80 have been canceled thereby rendering the rejection moot. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

Claims 102-109 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 102-109 have been canceled thereby rendering the rejection moot. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

Claims 111 and 121-126 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 111 and 121-126 have been canceled thereby rendering the rejection moot. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

Claims 112 and 127-133 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 112 and 127-133 have been canceled thereby rendering the rejection moot. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

Claims 113 and 134-140 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 113 and 134-140 have been canceled thereby rendering the rejection moot. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

Claims 114 and 141-147 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which

applicant regards as the invention. Claims 114 and 141-147 have been canceled thereby rendering the rejection moot. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

Claim 159 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 159 has been canceled thereby rendering the rejection moot. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

Claim 162 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 162 has been canceled thereby rendering the rejection moot. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

#### 4. Claim Rejection 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-4, 8, 28-31, 33, 34, 41, 53-55, 57, 58, 62, 81-87, 110, 115-117, 148-151 and 154-161 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Pryor (U.S. Publication No. US 2002/0036617 A1).

Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-4, 8, 28-31, 33, 34, 41, 53-55, 57, 58, 62, 81-87, 110, 115-117, 148-151 and 154-161 have been canceled, thereby rendering the rejection moot. However, in view of advancing the prosecution of this application, Applicants will address potential rejections to new claims 163-198 in view of the Pryor reference.

Applicants respectfully submit that the Pryor reference does not anticipate the presently claimed invention. Specifically, Pryor does not teach a method for manipulating a virtual object with a virtual interface component. As recited in the claims, the virtual interface component is generated and presented on a display server. The virtual interface component is used to generate or alter a two- or three-dimensional virtual object. In sharp contrast, Pryor does not teach, suggest, or discuss the use of a virtual interface component to generate or manipulate a virtual object. Rather, Pryor merely teaches that a physical layout component may be used to generate three-dimensional objects.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that the 35 USC § 102(b) rejection has been overcome and requests allowance of the pending claims.

5. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 9-12, 32, 35-37 and 56 have been rejected by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pryor (U.S. Publication No. US 2002/0036617 A1). Claims 9-12, 32, 35-37 and 56 have been canceled thereby rendering the rejection moot. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

Claims 88 and 89 have been rejected by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pryor (U.S. Publication No. US 2002/0036617 A1). Claims 88 and 89 have been canceled thereby rendering the rejection moot. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

Claims 92 and 93 have been rejected by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pryor (U.S. Publication No. US 2002/0036617 A1). Claims 92 and 93 have been canceled thereby rendering the rejection moot. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

Claims 95-97 have been rejected by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pryor (U.S. Publication No. US 2002/0036617 A1). Claims 95-97 have been canceled thereby rendering the rejection moot. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

Claims 152 and 153 have been rejected by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pryor (U.S. Publication No. US 2002/0036617 A1). Claims 152 and 153 have been canceled thereby rendering the rejection moot. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

Claims 5-7, 13-15, 17, 20, 21, 38-40, 42, 45, 46, 59-61, 63, 66 and 67 have been rejected by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pryor (U.S. Publication No. US 2002/0036617 A1) in view of Harvill et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,222,523 B1). Claims 5-7, 13-

Application No. 10/791,972  
Amendment Dated February 27, 2006  
Reply to Office Action of September 7, 2005

15, 17, 20, 21, 38-40, 42, 45, 46, 59-61, 63, 66 and 67 have been canceled thereby rendering the rejection moot. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

Claims 22, 24-27, 47, 49-52, 68, 70-73, 98-101 and 118-120 have been rejected by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pryor (U.S. Publication No. US 2002/0036617 A1) in view of Kumar et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,222,465 B1). Claims 22, 24-27, 47, 49-52, 68, 70-73, 98-101 and 118-120 have been canceled thereby rendering the rejection moot. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

### CONCLUSION

Applicants have made an earnest and *bona fide* effort to clarify the issues before the Examiner and to place this case in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance of all of claims 163-198 is believed to be in order, and a timely Notice of Allowance to this effect is respectfully requested.

A three-month extension of time and the appropriate fees are included with the submission of this paper. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees required with the submission of this paper from Deposit Account No. 502811.

Should the Examiner have any questions concerning the foregoing, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned attorney at (310) 712-8300. The undersigned attorney can normally be reached Monday through Friday from about 9:00 AM to 6:00 PM Pacific Time.

Date: February 27, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

J.D. Harriman II

Reg. No. 31,967

Customer Number 30076

Brown Raysman Millstein Felder & Steiner LLP  
1880 Century Park East, Suite 1200  
Los Angeles, California 90067-1621